

Division of the State Architect Advisory Board

DRAFT Minutes of Annual Meeting Friday, October 14, 2005 8:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Kellogg West Conference Center & Lodge
3801 West Temple Avenue
Pomona, CA 91768

DSA Advisory Board Members Present

Lowell Shields, Chair
Art Ross, Vice Chair
Gale Bate
Paul Beyl, Jr.
Kerry Clegg
Ed Darden
Robert Dyson
Stephanie Gonos
Kennith Hall
Richard Henry
Charles Higuera
JoAnn Koplin
Richard "Pete" Peterson
John Paul Scott
Dennis Shallenberger

State Agency Representatives

Gary McGavin, Seismic Safety Commission
Daniel Najera, State Fire Marshal
Michael Reichle, California Geological Survey

Board Members Absent

Dave Clinchy
Mike Modugno
Thomas Shih
David Smith
Jim Ward

DSA Staff Present

David Thorman, State Architect
Mary Ann Aguayo, Exec. Dir., DSA AB
John Baca
Dennis Bellet
Nat Chauhan
Richard Conrad
Dan Levernier
Mahendra Mehta
Aaron Noble
Liz Schroeder
Howard "Chip" Smith
Shaf Ullah

Others Present

Gino Bastianon, Frick, Frick & Jetté
Elouise Bird, Sof' Solutions, Inc.
Doug Dimmitt, Class I IOR
Robert Heath, Fibar
Eric Huber, Dave Bang Associates, Inc.
David Karina, IOR
Adrianne Price, Cal Poly architecture
student
David Spease, National Play Safety
Institute

Call to Order and Introductions

DSA Advisory Board Chair Lowell Shields called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. and welcomed everyone to the second day of the Board's two-day annual retreat.

Participants took turns introducing themselves.

Mr. Shields expressed his appreciation to Ms. Mary Ann Aguayo, Ms. Elizabeth Schroeder, and the rest of the staff for their hard work in arranging the meeting. He thanked State Architect David Thorman for supporting the Board and its planning process.

1 Mr. Shields said the staff will be distributing surveys later, and he encouraged Board
2 members to complete the surveys and indicate their committee assignment
3 preferences.

4
5 Mr. Shields noted that four Board members whose terms will be expiring were
6 recognized at dinner the previous evening. He thanked Mr. Rich Henry, Mr. Ed Darden,
7 Mr. Mike Modugno, and Mr. David Smith for their efforts and wished them well in their
8 future endeavors. Mr. Shields added that these long-term members will be difficult to
9 replace, and he expressed his gratitude for their service.

10 11 **Chair's Report**

12 **Outcome of Planning Meeting**

13 Mr. Shields noted the Board's planning session focused on defining the focus and
14 issues of the Board and its committees. He said Mr. Thorman presented a list of
15 important priority issues for DSA in the coming year. After extensive discussion, Board
16 members realigned and refocused its priorities, and the result was six committees:
17 Codes and Standards, Excellence, Inspection and Testing, Policies and Procedures,
18 Access, and Emergency Preparedness. Mr. Shields described each committee's scope
19 and charge. He said the committee name changes are intended to better reflect their
20 missions and focus.

21
22 Mr. Ed Darden asked about the distinction between the universal design issues under
23 the Excellence Committee and the issues the Access Committee will address. Mr.
24 Shields explained that universal design is a policy issue, while access is more an issue
25 of interpreting codes and standards.

26
27 Mr. John Paul Scott agreed, and noted universal design is a philosophy or approach to
28 design, and accessibility is the measurement of how well designs work for people with
29 disabilities. He said the accessibility group tends to look at code language and
30 interpretation issues.

31 32 **Approval of Minutes - July 21, 2005**

33 Mr. Shields drew attention to the minutes of the July 21 Board meeting under Tab 1 and
34 welcomed comments.

35
36 Ms. Stephanie Gonos stated that she attended the meeting, and she asked that her
37 name be added to the Page 1 roster.

38
39 Referring to Page 10, Line 38, Mr. Bob Dyson noted the word "met" should be inserted
40 between "had" and "six times."

41
42 **Mr. Dyson made a motion, seconded by Mr. Kenneth Hall, to approve the July 21**
43 **minutes as amended. The motion was carried unanimously.**

44 45 **Committee Reports & Annual Summaries**

46 **Building Standards Committee**

47 Committee Vice Chair Gail Bate referred to the materials under Tab 2. He noted the
48 Building Standards Committee only met twice over the past year, in part reflecting the
49 confusion over which model code the state was going to adopt. He said the committee
50 focused attention at its February 17 meeting on the NFPA codes, and most of the
51 discussion at the August 18 meeting pertained to adoption of the ICC and DSA's plans
52 for that process. Mr. Bate added that the committee is likely to be very busy in the

1 coming year assisting DSA with the code adoption process.

2
3 Mr. Bate reported that the committee voted on no motions at its August 18 meeting. He
4 said that besides talking about the ICC adoption process, the committee discussed
5 some follow-up items, including glulam beams, and identified other issues for the
6 coming year. Mr. Bate noted the next committee meeting will take place in December.
7 He recommended that the Board accept the meeting report as presented.
8

9 **Mr. Hall made a motion, seconded by Mr. Dyson, to accept the report of the**
10 **Building Standards Committee's August 18 meeting.**

11
12 Mr. Shields observed that glulam beams is still a priority issue. Mr. Bate advised that
13 the committee is awaiting further word from DSA on this subject.
14

15 Mr. Dyson said one of the code amendments addresses the topic.
16

17 Mr. Shields noted Mr. Chip Smith will be providing an update on DSA's code adoption
18 activities later in the meeting.
19

20 **The motion was carried unanimously.**
21

22 Mr. Shields proposed not setting future committee meeting dates at the end of the
23 meeting. He noted the membership and chairs of some committees will be changing,
24 so it might be better to wait until the new members have joined.
25

26 Mr. Bate said the Building Standards Committee proposed an early December meeting
27 in order to fit within the DSA process. Mr. Dyson expressed his opinion that it would be
28 best to select target meeting dates as soon as possible.
29

30 Mr. Shields noted the survey Board members will be completing asks about committee
31 preferences and willingness to serve as committee chairs. He added that he had no
32 objections to the committee chairs proposing meeting dates if they had preferences
33

34 **Excellence in Public Building Committee**

35 Committee Co-Chair Charles Higuera reported that the Excellence Committee met on
36 September 9. He said the committee has been reviewing materials to post on the DSA
37 Website at the CSBA conference in December, so much of the staff's effort in recent
38 months has been focused on developing content. He noted seven topic areas have
39 been identified, and each topic area leader is responsible for delineating the contents
40 and subtopics, and then authors are assigned to prepare information pieces for each
41 item.
42

43 Mr. Higuera thanked Mr. Richard Conrad for his hard work on this project. He said all
44 materials published on DSA's Website need to be reviewed and approved by the State
45 Architect for tone and content. He encouraged Board members to submit comments
46 and suggestions as soon as possible. Mr. Higuera said DSA will be soliciting feedback
47 from Website users in December, and then the content will be evaluated and revised as
48 needed.
49

50 Committee Co-Chair JoAnn Koplin suggested forming a subcommittee to help the staff
51 get the materials ready for the conference. Mr. Higuera asked specific Board
52 members to assist with reviewing the materials. He said the seven topic areas are

1 creating legacy facilities, efficiency and cost-effectiveness in design, planning and
2 teamwork for success, designed to maximize student performance, new directions in
3 school facilities, asset management, and design to maximize student safety.

4
5 Ms. Koplin drew attention to the list on Page 12, showing topics and assigned authors.

6
7 **Mr. Dennis Shallenberger made a motion, seconded by Mr. Bate, to accept the**
8 **Excellence in Public Building Committee's report.**

9
10 Mr. Shields thanked Mr. Higuera and Ms. Koplin for their efforts and commended the
11 committee for its progress on this task. He said the end product will be an extremely
12 useful document that will help schools apply excellence principles to their facilities.

13
14 Mr. Higuera noted the primary end users of the document will be school board
15 members and architects, and the intent is to familiarize them with DSA and facilitate
16 future interactions. Mr. Shields commented that this efforts fits nicely with a DSA pilot
17 project involving community colleges, to be discussed later in the meeting. He said
18 DSA hopes to extend this pilot project to the K-12 arena.

19
20 **The motion was carried unanimously.**

21
22 **Inspector Committee**

23 Committee Chair Dennis Shallenberger reported that the committee met three times
24 during the past year. He noted the committee has been advising the DSA staff on
25 issues related to the inspector certification process, the exams, inspector qualifications,
26 disciplinary procedures, and DSA's laboratory testing and inspection program.

27
28 Mr. Shallenberger welcomed direction from the Board as to whether the committee
29 should address elevator inspections, an issue raised in a recent appeal. He explained
30 that there were concerns that the Cal OSHA inspections may not adequately cover
31 structural requirements for elevators.

32
33 Mr. Shallenberger said the committee has been working on revising the language
34 required for architects and engineers signing reports, and progress is being made on
35 this issue.

36
37 Mr. Shallenberger drew attention to the article on Page 41 of the meeting packet,
38 criticizing the ultrasound and welding inspection industry, and the response from the
39 California Council of Testing and Inspection Agencies. He said he also wrote a
40 response, and he distributed copies. Mr. Shallenberger acknowledged that there may
41 be some unscrupulous laboratories operating, but they are a very small minority.

42
43 Mr. Shallenberger drew attention to the minutes of the committee's September 1
44 meeting and recommended approval.

45
46 **Mr. Paul Beyl made a motion, seconded by Mr. Dyson, to accept the meeting**
47 **report as presented.**

48
49 Mr. Shallenberger said the only motion passed by the committee was to request
50 guidance from the Board regarding elevator inspections.

51 Mr. Shallenberger volunteered to continue chairing the Inspection and Testing

1 Committee. He invited interested Board members to join, and he encouraged existing
2 members to stay on.

3
4 Mr. Shields encouraged committees to think about including non-Board members with
5 expertise in specific areas.

6
7 Mr. Shields noted the Board receives information pieces from time to time, such as the
8 articles about ultrasound and welding inspections. He clarified that these materials do
9 not necessarily reflect the views of DSA or the Advisory Board, but are provided for
10 informational purposes.

11
12 **The motion was carried unanimously.**

13
14 **Policy and Procedures Committee**

15 Committee Chair Lowell Shields said the Policy and Procedures Committee had a
16 second appeal this year, regarding waterless urinals, and that experience highlighted
17 the need to make some revisions to the appeal process. He directed Board members'
18 attention to the flow chart on Page 11 under Tab 5, followed by the draft process. Mr.
19 Shields noted the appeals process had been intended for other types of issues, and the
20 committee will be spending more time in the coming year discussing the process.

21
22 Referring to Page 15, Subparagraph (d) under "Rights of the Applicant," Mr. Shields
23 advised that DSA had interpreted this language as allowing appellants to appeal
24 unacceptable DSA decisions to the Building Standards Commission, but DGS legal
25 counsel later determined that this provision did not apply to certain types of issues. He
26 added that this language is still being worked out.

27
28 Mr. Bate asked if there will be a determination early in the appeal process as to whether
29 an issue relates to building standards. Mr. Shields commented that such an early
30 determination would be helpful. Ms. Aguayo advised that by the time an appeal comes
31 to the Board, it will be reviewed by DSA staff to make sure it involves a building code
32 issue.

33
34 Mr. Shields said the committee proposed revised language to reflect addition of the
35 community college representative on the Board. He added that any changes to Board
36 composition will require a change in regulations.

37
38 Mr. Shields recommended that the Board accept the committee's report.

39
40 **Mr. Kerry Clegg made a motion, seconded by Mr. Art Ross, to accept the Policy**
41 **and Procedures Committee report.**

42
43 Mr. Beyl asked if the review process described in the report was the one currently being
44 used by DSA. Mr. Shields responded that committee is recommending that DSA adopt
45 the revised process, subject to legal review and internal DGS review. He clarified that
46 the Board is being asked to approve this recommendation as part of the meeting report.

47
48 Mr. Pete Peterson noted the Universal Design Committee includes a special code
49 consultant representative, and he asked if that person was still needed. Mr. Scott
50 advised that the committee voted to delete that NFPA liaison position, although this
51 action is not reflected in the meeting report. He said this change was approved at the
52 same time as the committee's name change.

1
2 Mr. Shields noted the committee composition is up to DSA. He drew attention to the
3 last bullet on Page 19, regarding consultant qualifications. One participant expressed
4 support for retaining a consultant position in case it is needed in the future.
5

6 **The motion was carried unanimously.**
7

8 **Safety and Emergency Response Committee**

9 Committee Chair JoAnn Koplin observed that recent disasters around the world have
10 demonstrated the importance of preparedness and response. She said the committee
11 takes very seriously its charge of protecting the school children of California. She noted
12 the attention focused on disasters may provide opportunities to improve safety in
13 California.
14

15 Ms. Koplin reported that the committee met in Los Angeles on September 14 at the Los
16 Angeles County emergency operations center offices. The County presented the new
17 emergency management plan for the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD).
18

19 Ms. Koplin noted that the committee's meeting was not recorded, and there are no
20 minutes. She asked the staff to notify committee chairs in advance when no recording
21 equipment will be available.
22

23 Ms. Koplin provided a copy of the LAUSD emergency plan and encouraged interested
24 participants to review the document. She said the plan will be posted on the Web site
25 and made available as a template for other school districts. She added that LAUSD is
26 considering developing training programs for other school districts as well. Ms. Koplin
27 noted the committee includes ongoing representation from LAUSD and the Red Cross.
28

29 Ms. Koplin said the Safety & Emergency Response Committee began looking at the
30 issue of DSA's authority to red-tag buildings after disasters, and that authority is now in
31 place. The committee pushed hard to get DSA's own emergency response plan in
32 place and implement SEMS training for the staff; the plan has been completed, and
33 SEMS training is underway. Ms. Koplin pointed out that these are very significant
34 accomplishments.
35

36 Ms. Koplin reported that the committee reviewed state seismic safety requirements for
37 public, private, and charter schools. She said the committee plans to refine the report
38 and forward it for agency endorsement during the coming year.
39

40 Ms. Koplin stated that the committee considered use of school facilities as emergency
41 shelters, examined Red Cross shelter policies, and reviewed a 1995 OES document.
42 The committee is in the process of updating the policy document so it can be distributed
43 to school districts across the state.
44

45 Ms. Koplin said the committee plans to look at post-earthquake performance-based
46 building assessment and evaluation criteria for school buildings. The committee
47 recommended that DSA study emergency portable building criteria. Another
48 recommendation was to evaluate DSA coordination with local emergency responders,
49 and to develop a response chart clarifying roles and responsibilities. The committee
50 recommended that DSA send an official letter to OES regarding the need to integrate
51 school district safety plans with plans of local municipalities.
52

Ms. Koplin reported that the committee also looked at requirements for emergency

1 supply bins at school sites. She clarified there is currently no requirement for such bins,
2 nor are there criteria for where and how bins should be placed at school sites. The
3 committee hopes to address these issues and bring recommendations forward to the
4 Board.

5
6 Ms. Koplin reported that committee representatives attended the 2005 Disaster
7 Resistant California conference. The committee recommends making a presentation at
8 the next conference, to be held in conjunction with the 100th anniversary of the 1906
9 earthquake in San Francisco. She said the conference will be focused on seismic
10 safety, and she suggested developing a presentation on seismic safety in school
11 construction. Ms. Koplin recommended that the Board approve moving forward with
12 this project.

13
14 Ms. Koplin stated that LAUSD representatives made two requests for assistance from
15 the Board: a checklist to determine if a facility is safe to be used as a shelter, and a
16 checklist to determine if a facility is safe for occupancy after an event.

17
18 Mr. * said post-disaster inspections and determinations of safety should be done by
19 qualified engineers. He expressed concern about creating a checklist for schools that
20 will substitute for the professional judgment of a licensed engineer. Ms. Koplin clarified
21 that the checklist would include having the building evaluated by a qualified inspector.
22 She said the committee found that after disasters, Red Cross comes in and conducts
23 and evaluation of a building, and school district officials assume that evaluation
24 addresses structural safety.

25
26 Mr. Bate added that the intent was not to create a sanctioned list, but a way of
27 improving the already-established process. Ms. Koplin agreed the list was more of a
28 process list than a checklist.

29
30 Ms. Aguayo apologized for not providing reporting and minutes services for committee
31 meetings. She said that as a result, the exact wording of the motions was not recorded.
32 Ms. Koplin offered to describe the motions from her notes.

33
34 Ms. Koplin said one motion was to develop a manual to assist school districts with all
35 facets of preparedness and emergency procedures, using the LAUSD template and
36 disseminating information on the Website. Ms. Koplin provided a sample elementary
37 school emergency response plan.

38
39 Mr. Hall added that LAUSD was happy to share its emergency plan and considers it a
40 public document.

41
42 Mr. Shields said the motion was to create a DSA-specific document.

43
44 Mr. Higuera explained that the committee wanted DSA to give this task its highest
45 priority. Ms. Koplin said the committee's second motion was to recommend that DSA
46 make development of this material a high priority and commit resources to deliver it in a
47 timely fashion, or seek outside funding to assist with this effort.

48
49 Mr. Peterson said his school district obtained state grant funds to develop a emergency
50 response plan. Board members talked about whether DSA funds should be used for
51 these purposes.

52 Mr. Hall pointed out the benefits of standardizing the format and content of the

1 emergency response plans. He noted the template can be made available to everyone,
2 regardless of funding source.

3
4 Mr. Dyson suggested voting on the two committee motions separately. Mr. Shields
5 asked Ms. Koplin to restate the motions.

6
7 Ms. Koplin said the first motion was to develop a manual to assist school districts with
8 all facets of preparedness and emergency procedures, utilizing the LAUSD template
9 and making it available on the Website.

10
11 **Ms. Stephanie Gonos made a motion, seconded by Mr. Shallenberger, to accept**
12 **the Safety and Emergency Response Committee's recommendation to develop**
13 **the manual as proposed.**

14
15 Mr. Dyson clarified that this task will consist of reviewing the LAUSD document and
16 creating a template for the DSA Website. Mr. Ross proposed giving the template to the
17 Excellence Committee so it can be incorporated in the DSA Academy and disseminated
18 through DSA's outreach programs.

19
20 Ms. Koplin said she viewed the committee's task not as creating a manual, but as
21 compiling and utilizing material that has already been created and submitting it for
22 approval and distribution by DSA.

23
24 Mr. Hall observed that school districts need to know all the critical elements of the
25 emergency plan so they can make sure all necessary topics are covered. Mr. Shields
26 suggested leaving this task up to the committee once the motion is approved.

27
28 **The motion was carried, 14 - 1 (Mr. Peterson opposed).**

29
30 Ms. Koplin said the committee also voted to recommend that DSA encourage and work
31 with OES to update the "Schools as Shelters" document for redistribution, and she
32 provided copies of the manual. She noted the committee plans to review the document
33 and provide proposed changes to OES.

34
35 **Mr. John Paul Scott made a motion, seconded by Mr. Dyson, to recommend that**
36 **DSA work with OES as proposed. The motion was carried unanimously.**

37
38 Ms. Koplin noted the committee's third motion was that DSA give high priority to
39 developing these materials, by either devoting the necessary staff and resources or
40 hiring a consultant.

41
42 **Mr. Higuera made a motion, seconded by Mr. Bate, to recommend that DSA give**
43 **this task a high priority. The motion was carried unanimously.**

44
45 Ms. Koplin recommended that the Board approve the committee's meeting report.

46
47 **Mr. Dyson made a motion, seconded by Ms. Gonos, to accept the committee's**
48 **report. The motion was carried unanimously.**

49
50
51 Mr. Shields noted that Ms. Robin Baker, DSA's administrative deputy, highlighted an

1 issue regarding the Seismic Safety Commission. He said the current funding
2 arrangements for the Commission will be expiring, and the governor vetoed AB 1374,
3 which would have extended the funded. The governor's veto message indicated that he
4 thought the Commission duplicates roles and functions of other agencies. Mr. Shields
5 pointed out that the Seismic Safety Commission has been a strong and effective
6 advocate for seismic safety in California, and has had a significant influence in
7 legislation. He recommended that DSA consider intervening to express support for
8 continued funding.

9 10 **Universal Design Committee**

11 Committee Chair John Paul Scott drew attention to the materials under Tab 7 of the
12 meeting packet. He said the Universal Design Committee met three times in the past
13 year. He noted the Board reviewed the May and July minutes, and the minutes of the
14 committee's September 15 meeting are included in the meeting packet.

15
16 Mr. Scott said the Universal Design Committee consists of 12 members, four of whom
17 are Advisory Board members, with one special liaison position held by Mr. Peter
18 Margen, a code specialist. The committee established two task groups, one to look at
19 door opening force and another to look at play area surfaces.

20
21 Mr. Scott reported that during the past year, the committee reviewed and provided
22 comments on a number of policies and code changes. He said the committee has
23 focused its attention on advising DSA as to developments in accessibility, tracking
24 Department of Justice certification of California's accessibility provisions, and planning a
25 process for reviewing Chapter 11B amendments and proposed new provisions. Mr.
26 Scott added that the committee reviewed and revised Chapter 11A, the residential
27 provisions, last year.

28
29 Mr. Scott said the committee's task groups discussed a number of controversial issues
30 related to door opening force and play area surfaces, but they were unable to resolve
31 the problems. He discussed and reviewed the recommendations from each task group.

32
33 On the topic of door opening force, Mr. Scott drew attention to Motion 080319, on Page
34 31 of the yellow pages in the meeting packet. He said there was a code change in 2002
35 that changed the 8½-pound door operating force on exterior doors to 5 pounds, and that
36 standard turned out to be unworkable without power-assisted door openers. Mr. Scott
37 added that this change was not developed by DSA's Access Task Group, nor was it
38 properly vetted or analyzed for economic impact.

39
40 Mr. Scott noted that at its first meeting, the committee voted to ask the State Architect
41 for an emergency change to repeal this code provision, and motions were passed at the
42 May, July, and September meetings asking the State Architect to rescind that code
43 change. He said the committee decided to start a public petition in September, and he
44 drew attention to the document in the meeting packet.

45
46 Mr. Scott stated that the committee worked on the policy, scoping, and technical
47 statements describing how and when power-assisted doors should be provided at the
48 entry to a facility. He said the committee's discussions are described on Pages 25
49 through 36 of the binder. Mr. Scott noted the committee voted to forward its
50 recommendations to the State Architect. He added there was one member of the public
51 who objected and recommended using another document developed by Holl'ann D'Lill*.
52

1 Ms. Aguayo advised that Motion 080319 had been approved by the DSA Advisory
2 Board at the last meeting. Another participant said the committee's policy change
3 recommendations were also received by the Board in July.

4
5 Mr. Scott suggested that the Advisory Board approve the committee's scope, technical,
6 and rationale for the emergency rulemaking.

7
8 Mr. Shields emphasized that the DSA Advisory Board and its committees serve in an
9 advisory function only, and it is up to DSA to decide whether to implement
10 recommendations.

11
12 **Mr. Scott made a motion, seconded by Mr. Peterson, that the Board accept the**
13 **committee's recommendations regarding door opening force and recommend**
14 **that DSA consider a code change or policy amendment. The motion was carried**
15 **unanimously.**

16
17 Mr. Scott directed attention to Motion 080402, calling for sending a letter thanking the
18 State Fire Marshal for attending the meeting and providing information on accessible
19 pull stations, and supporting joint meetings to harmonize issues between Chapter 10
20 and Chapter 11B of the California Building Code.

21
22 **Mr. Scott made a motion, seconded by Mr. Darden, to authorize the committee to**
23 **write a letter thanking the State Fire Marshal and accept the invitation to continue**
24 **working together as proposed.**

25
26 Mr. Dyson asked about the DSA's policies for approving letters. He expressed his
27 opinion that committees should be allowed to send certain kinds of communication,
28 such as thank-you letters and appropriate professional acknowledgments.

29
30 Mr. Shields proposed having the committee write a letter to forward to DSA for review
31 and mailing.

32
33 Ms. Aguayo advised that the Advisory Board's policies state that all communications
34 should be routed through the Board chair. Mr. Shields volunteered to write a letter on
35 behalf of the Board.

36
37 Mr. Scott amended the motion to provide that Mr. Shields, working with the staff and
38 DSA, draft a letter for the DSA Advisory Board's review and approval.

39
40 **The motion was carried unanimously.**

41
42 Mr. Scott referred to Motion 080503, a request that someone from DSA and/or the UDC
43 draft an article for the next issue of the *Universal Design Newsletter*, a quarterly
44 publication, regarding what California has been doing to encourage universal design in
45 public buildings and the latest in accessibility codes. He volunteered to help draft the
46 article. Mr. Shields recommended having the article vetted through the committee and
47 DSA before submitting it for publication.

48
49 **Mr. Scott made a motion, seconded by Mr. Peterson, to authorize drafting of the**
50 **article as proposed. The motion was carried unanimously.**
51

1 Mr. Aaron Noble clarified that pull stations were not part of the letter going to the State
2 Fire Marshal.

3
4 Mr. Scott said Mr. Richard Skaff raised the issue of pull station accessibility. He noted
5 the committee discussed the issue and decided not to get involved in product approval
6 issues. Mr. Bate confirmed that understanding. He added that the committee
7 recognized there is considerable controversy about fire alarm pull stations, and decided
8 to defer to the wishes of the Board as whether this should be left to the State Fire
9 Marshal. Board members agreed that this issue should not be included in the letter.

10
11 Mr. Scott said the play area surface task force resulted from issues raised at the
12 committee's first meeting and subsequent discussions about engineered wood fiber as
13 a suitable surface for play surfaces. He referred to the committee's resolution on Page
14 37, asking that DSA develop a policy or code amendment regarding accessible play
15 areas and the use of impact attenuation materials within play areas. He noted the
16 meeting packet also includes public comments on this issue.

17
18 Mr. Scott informed the Board that the committee concluded there are gaps in current
19 playground regulations. State statutes require inspections by a certified inspector prior
20 to use, but there is no enforcement; technical standards defining play equipment and
21 surface materials do not explain how access between asphalt and play boxes should be
22 provided; and there is no information for school districts about how to maintain
23 engineered wood fiber surfaces. Mr. Scott said the play group tried to pull everything
24 together for the State Architect. He recommended forwarding the committee's
25 resolution, the ten recommendations, and the supporting documents to DSA so DSA
26 can consider building code and policy amendments regarding play areas and the use of
27 impact attenuation materials. He added that the committee was not unanimous in its
28 final vote.

29
30 **Mr. Scott made a motion, seconded by Mr. Peterson, to forward the committee's**
31 **resolution and recommendations to DSA as proposed.**

32
33 Mr. * expressed his opinion that DSA should stay out of this issue. He said DSA should
34 regulate public safety, but should not dictate maintenance practices for particular
35 products.

36
37 Mr. Aaron Noble said DSA has had a policy in place since 1997. Mr. Scott clarified that
38 the committee had rejected DSA's proposed policy revisions because the committee
39 feels the policy is inadequate and does not address the committee's concerns.

40
41 Mr. Shields asked Mr. Scott to articulate what the committee was recommending.
42 Mr. Scott responded that the committee voted to recommend that DSA prohibit
43 engineered wood fiber and other loose materials for accessible route surfaces. He said
44 the committee also defined the play box.

45
46 One participant questioned whether DSA should ban any materials that meet ASTM
47 requirements.

48
49 Mr. Shields asked why two out of three of the Board members on the committee voted
50 against this motion.

51 Mr. Peterson said ASTM defines suitable materials for accessible paths, although critics
52 say only static tests were conducted. He stated he was reluctant to eliminate products

1 that meet the existing standards, and suggested working to change the standards if
2 necessary. Mr. Peterson agreed with other committee members that there should be
3 better ways of providing paths of travel to play boxes and better designs to access play
4 boxes. However, he noted, DSA should not dictate designs or become a reviewer of
5 playground surface materials. Mr. Peterson pointed out this would put an extra burden
6 on inspectors as well.

7
8 Participants expressed concern about cost impacts and the perception that DSA was
9 endorsing any particular materials. Mr. Scott pointed out that the committee
10 recommends basing the standard on the firmness and stability of the surface rather than
11 the materials used to achieve level of performance.

12
13 Mr. Bate said he agreed with Mr. Peterson that DSA should not get into product
14 approvals.

15
16 Mr. Noble stated that DSA has concerns about maintenance problems with engineered
17 wood fiber materials because they need to be properly maintained in order to be kept
18 accessible. He said the U.S. Access Board has looked at engineered wood fiber and
19 determined that it meets standards for use around play equipment, to cushion falls, and
20 to access equipment. Mr. Scott noted that the material should not be used for ramps
21 and accessible paths of travel.

22
23 Mr. Scott said the committee learned that most materials testing takes place in
24 laboratories rather than in the field, so actual conditions are not taken into
25 consideration. He added that the committee's recommendation is based on health and
26 welfare.

27
28 Mr. Hall supported the idea of DSA developing standards for initial installation and
29 specifying compression standards, but staying away from dictating materials.

30
31 Mr. Scott reported that the U.S. Forest Service and U.S. Access Board conducted a
32 two-year study on adding urethane binders to wood chips. He noted poured-in-place
33 rubber might be an alternative. Mr. Peterson added that poured-in-place rubber has
34 disadvantages too.

35
36 Mr. Shields invited brief comments from members of the public.

37
38 Mr. Robert Heath, chairman of ASTM's Playground Surfacing Subcommittee, said
39 ASTM Standard 1951 addresses this issue. He noted there are over 10,000 engineered
40 wood fiber certified playground installations in the U.S., and there have been no
41 accessibility complaints in the past 25 years, except for one recent case. Mr. Heath
42 reported that he visited a number of playgrounds himself and agreed with Mr. Scott and
43 the committee that many playgrounds have accessibility issues. He observed that the
44 accessibility problems were not due to the engineered wood fiber, but to poorly
45 designed original installations that had not followed the manufacturers' instructions.

46
47 Mr. Heath provided a list of eight simple and inexpensive steps regarding installation
48 and maintenance, and noted seven of them have to do with the original installation. He
49 noted engineered wood fiber should be installed only on above-ground surfaces with
50 side supports and that have ramps going down both sides. He said most engineered
51 wood fiber surfaces need to be replaced about every three years.

1 Mr. Heath said industry manufacturers are committed to do better educating schools
2 and architects about installation and maintenance. He welcomed further interaction with
3 DSA, the Universal Design Committee, and the accessibility community.

4
5 Ms. Elouise Bird, president, Sof' Solutions, echoed Mr. Heath's comments. She said
6 manufacturers of engineered wood fiber would like the opportunity to work with DSA
7 and the committee to address their concerns and arrive at a mutually acceptable
8 solution.

9
10 Mr. David Spease, National Playground Safety Institute, acknowledged that there are
11 gaps in current regulations that need to be addressed, but he urged DSA not to
12 automatically rule out any materials that meet ASTM standards.

13
14 Mr. Shields observed that the committee made a number of excellent
15 recommendations, and he cautioned against throwing them all out. He emphasized that
16 the recommendations forwarded to DSA are advisory only, and they help make DSA
17 aware of the level of debate that went on. Mr. Shields reminded Board members that a
18 motion was pending to forward the recommendations to DSA.

19
20 Mr. Peterson asked Mr. Scott to restate the motion. Mr. Scott said the motion was to
21 pass the committee's resolution on to the State Architect with a recommendation to
22 develop a policy or building code amendment regarding accessible play areas and the
23 use of impact attenuation materials. He noted there are ten separate recommendations
24 for DSA's consideration, including one to prohibit engineered wood fiber surfaces on
25 accessible paths of travel.

26
27 Mr. Kerry Clegg noted DSA already has a policy, so the recommendation should really
28 be to review and revise the policy to make it consistent with currently accepted access
29 standards and laws, rather than writing new policy.

30
31 Mr. Scott said he did not accept that amendment because the existing policy only deals
32 with engineered wood fiber in routes, not the adequacy of the state law or the lack of
33 plan-checking and inspection of school playgrounds.

34
35 Ms. Gonos said she had no problem forwarding the issue to DSA, but was reluctant to
36 exclude any products.

37
38 Mr. Scott stated that the committee was quite adamant that engineered wood fiber
39 should not be allowed as an accessible surface.

40
41 Mr. Hall proposed dividing the motion into two parts, one pertaining to the
42 recommendation to prohibit engineered wood fiber and a second to approve the other
43 nine recommendations. After some discussion, the Board voted on the original motion.

44
45 **The motion failed, 3 - 11 - 1 (Mr. Dyson, Mr. Art Ross, and Mr. Scott in favor; Mr.**
46 **Peterson abstaining; all others opposed).**

47
48 Mr. Shields expressed his appreciation to the committee and the task force for its hard
49 work on this issue. He noted that even if a vote is not approved, DSA will know more
50 about the debate and the controversy.

51 **Ms. Gonos made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hall, to forward the committee's**
52 **resolution to DSA for consideration in developing building code amendments for**

1 **accessible play areas.**

2
3 Ms. Gonos clarified that the motion did not include an endorsement of the committee's
4 recommendations.

5
6 **Mr. Peterson proposed amending the motion to forward the issue to DSA from the**
7 **DSA Advisory Board rather than the committee. The maker and seconder of the**
8 **motion accepted this amendment, and the motion was carried unanimously.**
9

10 Mr. Heath stated that the Board's discussion and action does not change the
11 commitment of the material manufacturers to continue working with DSA to arrive at an
12 acceptable solution.

13
14 In conclusion, Mr. Scott said, the committee recommends retiring the two task forces on
15 play areas and door opening force.
16

17 **Administration**

18 **Executive Director's Report**

19 Ms. Aguayo provided a recap of the DSA Advisory Board staff's activities over the past
20 year. She noted that even when the Board does not meet, the staff is busy with a
21 number of ongoing tasks. She reported that during the past year, the DSA Advisory
22 Board established a Web page for posting Board agendas, minutes, and other
23 documents. Ms. Aguayo said the staff has been focusing on tracking actions taken by
24 the Board and its committees to ensure proper follow-up.
25

26 Ms. Aguayo advised that the staff will be providing Board members with an orientation
27 briefing at the January meeting about conduct of meetings, reports, open meeting notice
28 requirements, and standard operating procedures.
29

30 Ms. Aguayo distributed a survey and requested that Board members take a few minutes
31 to respond. She noted the survey asks Board members to indicate committee
32 preferences.
33

34 Mr. Shields asked Board members to comment on the format of the annual meeting.
35 He welcomed ideas and suggestions for improvement.
36

37 Mr. Shields drew attention to the updated Board and committee rosters. He noted the
38 expiration of each Board member's staggered term is indicated.
39

40 Ms. Aguayo reported that DSA has received a few nominations for the vacant Board
41 seats, and more are being solicited. She said DSA hopes to have new members
42 appointed by the January meeting.
43

44 Mr. Shields encouraged committees to consider meeting in different locations in
45 northern, central, and southern parts of the state to facilitate broader participation. Ms.
46 Aguayo said teleconferencing and videoconferencing can also be used to reduce travel
47 time and meeting costs.
48

49 Mr. Scott thanked Ms. Aguayo, Mr. Noble, and Ms. Liz Schroeder for providing support
50 to the committee. He especially commended the staff for developing the tracking
51 system to follow up on motions.
52

1 At 11:30 a.m., the meeting was recessed for lunch. Mr. Shields reconvened the
2 meeting at 12:30 p.m.
3

4 **State Architect's Report**

5 State Architect David Thorman expressed his appreciation to the DSA Advisory Board
6 for its advice and feedback and said he wanted the Board to continue.
7

8 Mr. Thorman noted that last year when the governor vetoed AB 3010, a bill that would
9 have transferred community college plan review responsibilities from DSA to the
10 community colleges, he indicated legislation was not needed because DSA and the
11 community colleges could resolve their issues. In response, a task force was formed
12 last January to look at the overall process and see where improvements could be made.
13 Mr. Thorman noted that although the task force concentrated on the community college
14 plan review process, its findings can be applied across the board to all building types
15 under DSA's jurisdiction.
16

17 Mr. Thorman described the composition and mission of the task force. He said the top
18 three problems the task force identified were timeliness, consistency, and accuracy.
19 DSA determined that the primary obstacles to improvement are chronic staff shortages,
20 incomplete plans from architects and designers, and lack of timely decisions by the
21 client.
22

23 Mr. Thorman said DSA is implementing the task force recommendations in four ways:
24 1) developing a collaborative process for project development and plan review that
25 includes DSA, the design professionals, and the community college district client; 2)
26 creating an Academy to provide ongoing training; 3) developing effective policies and
27 procedures; and 4) providing guidelines for implementation. Mr. Thorman reviewed the
28 normal steps in project planning, design, plan review, construction, and close-out, and
29 he pointed out ways that better collaboration could improve the entire process.
30

31 Mr. Thorman reported that DSA is engaged in pilot projects with a few select community
32 college districts and design professionals to see how these improvements work. He
33 observed that these changes represent a major paradigm shift for DSA and design
34 professionals, and implementation will require considerable effort and cooperation from
35 DSA clients.
36

37 Mr. Thorman said the DSA Academy is being developed as a vehicle for training DSA
38 staff, plan review consultants, design professionals, and clients. He noted the initial
39 course offerings will include DSA 101, an overview of the DSA process, and training in
40 access compliance and fire life safety for plan reviewers.
41

42 Mr. Thorman reported that DSA has implementing a recruiting plan to help address staff
43 shortages. He noted DSA has booths at professional conferences, and he showed a
44 sample recruiting poster and brochure.
45

46 Mr. Thorman advised that DSA has been using electronic plan review in Oakland, and
47 DSA staff in Sacramento, Los Angeles, and San Diego are being trained to operate
48 electronic programs in those offices.
49

50 Mr. Thorman said DSA is considering reorganizing the regional offices to achieve better
51 consistency in terms of positions, growth possibilities, and personnel. In addition, DSA
52 might open three satellite offices in Los Angeles to spread some of the heavy workload

1 in that area. Mr. Thorman noted that implementing a concept of virtual offices in the
2 future, like virtual plan review, gives even more flexibility in terms of locations.

3
4 Mr. Thorman stated that DSA is addressing the need for consistency and accuracy by
5 creating statewide teams in each discipline, composed of people from headquarters and
6 the regional offices. He said the intent is to improve overall consistency and accuracy in
7 structural safety, fire life safety, access, and other areas.

8
9 In terms of client relations, Mr. Thorman emphasized the need to improve
10 communications and expand outreach. He said DSA will continue working closely with
11 AIA, CASH, CCFC, SEAOC, and other organizations to actively solicit and exchange
12 information. He encouraged the Advisory Board to expand its outreach as well.

13
14 Mr. Thorman noted DSA has a teambuilding consultant working with the executive
15 team, and that effort will help upper management learn more successful ways of dealing
16 with the public and with each other.

17
18 Mr. * commented that in addition to design professionals and staff, people in the
19 community colleges, UC, and CSU systems would also benefit from Academy training.

20
21 Mr. Art Ross said that when DSA was first talking about establishing an Academy, there
22 was discussion about offering training in school construction for contractors. He
23 recommended targeting school administrators, design professionals, and contractors.

24
25 Mr. Dyson noted that Mr. Thorman's presentation referred to the completeness of plans,
26 including signs and seals. He clarified that the engineering registration law dissuades
27 engineers from signing and sealing documents until they are construction-ready, after
28 plan review. He cautioned against requiring signing and stamping with early submittals.

29
30 Participants asked when the process steps can be applied to K-12 projects. Mr.
31 Thorman confirmed that DSA plans to expand the effort after the pilot projects.

32
33 Mr. Darden commented that DSA has been struggling with the problem of incomplete
34 plans for years. He noted the triage system was supposed to screen plans and reject
35 those that were incomplete. He expressed concern that the presentation could
36 exaggerate the problem. Mr. Darden said his experience shows most problems are due
37 to incompetent or inexperienced architects, or too much pressure from clients. He
38 observed that clients need to understand that design professionals need adequate time
39 to do a good job with the drawings from the start. Mr. Darden noted that the success of
40 the process changes depends on cooperation from DSA as well as clients.

41
42 Board members discussed the present triage system. They encouraged DSA to
43 develop a timeline so DSA customers have realistic expectations for planning purposes.

44
45 Mr. * observed that community college projects tend to be bigger, more complicated,
46 and more like commercial projects than school projects. He suggested that DSA
47 consider specializing in response to this increasing sector.

48
49 Mr. Shields thanked Mr. Thorman for his report.

50
51 **DSA Regional Managers' Reports**
52 Bay Area Office

1 Mr. Nat Chauhan gave an overview of the area served by DSA's Bay Area Office in
2 Oakland. He reported that the Bay Area Office received 744 projects, valued at \$1.32
3 billion last year, and since July 1, 2005, the office had received another 198 projects,
4 worth about \$260 million. He observed that this volume is less than 25 percent of the
5 total for the state. Mr. Chauhan said the Bay Area closed 232 projects in 2004-05, and
6 closed 159 projects so far this year. He reviewed appointment wait times and average
7 turnaround times.

8
9 Mr. Chauhan described the staff positions at the Bay Area Office and noted there are
10 currently eight vacant positions. He said the staff will be moving to another floor in the
11 building next spring.

12
13 Mr. Chauhan noted the Oakland office has been using electronic plan review, and this
14 effort will be expanded in the future. He said key challenges are space limitations and
15 close-outs.

16 Sacramento Office

17
18 Mr. Dan Levernier said the Sacramento Office's workload was very heavy in September
19 due to the rush to get projects in before the new energy code goes into effect October 1.
20 He noted a significant amount of work is being contracted out, with 35 consulting firms
21 available as needed.

22
23 Mr. Levernier described the staff positions and vacancies at the Sacramento Office. He
24 said staff people received training recently in project close-outs, and that effort has
25 already had an impact on close-out statistics.

26
27 Mr. Levernier reported that the Sacramento Office has been involved in pilot projects for
28 electronic submittal of closing documents and electronic plan review. He noted the IT
29 staff is working to develop standard formats for the electronic plan review process.

30 Los Angeles Office

31
32 Mr. Shaf Ullah reported that the Los Angeles Office moved to new headquarters in
33 August, and both staff and clients are pleased with the convenient location near Union
34 Station. He said the staff also looks forward to implementing electronic plan checking.

35
36 In terms of workload, Mr. Ullah reported that the Los Angeles Office received 300
37 projects, worth about \$600 million. Of those, 226 were K-12 projects and 25 were for
38 community colleges. Mr. Ullah said that like other offices, the L.A. Office has been
39 doing more contracting out to make up for staff shortages. He added that recruiting new
40 staff people remains a difficult challenge.

41 San Diego Office

42
43 Mr. Mahendra Mehta reviewed the staff positions in the San Diego Office. He displayed
44 a chart showing the history of the office workload in terms of number of projects and
45 dollar values. He noted the San Diego Office did about \$35 billion worth of work in just
46 the past five years. Mr. Mehta said the San Diego Office has been receiving about
47 \$200 million in projects per month since January 2005, a volume equivalent to DSA's
48 entire workload in 1989 or 1990. He commended the staff for their hard work.

49 Mr. Mehta discussed the staff's current workload and average bin times. He said key
50 issues and concerns include the large volume of work, large backlog, long bin time,
51 numerous high-priority projects, and staff recruitment. He noted consultants are doing a
52 great deal of work, but some tasks still need to be done by DSA staff.

1
2 Mr. Mehta asked the Board for assistance with recruiting, setting standards for complete
3 plan submittals, encouraging greater involvement from owners, promoting awareness of
4 access requirements, and training for design professionals. He welcomed suggestions.

5
6 Mr. Shields said the Board talked about some of the items on the list at its planning
7 session the previous day, so there may be some progress this year.

8
9 Ms. Aguayo noted Board members received a written legislative summary earlier.

10 11 **Stakeholder Participation in DSA's IBC Adoption Process**

12 Mr. Howard "Chip" Smith said the electronic stakeholder feedback system is not yet
13 operational, but the staff is working to address a missing driver on DSA's computer. He
14 reported that the final testing stages are nearly complete, and the system will be
15 activated in a few weeks.

16
17 Mr. Smith referred to the summary of the stakeholder involvement process in the
18 meeting packet. He said the steps in the process and a list of stakeholders are now
19 available online. He added that 470 names have been submitted to the mailing list, and
20 240 people have indicated an interest in participating in the IBC code adoption process.

21
22 Mr. Smith said interested people can provide input to DSA using a series of templates
23 for commenting on specific amendments and code provisions and receiving notification
24 of proposed decisions. He reviewed the anticipated schedule for the stakeholder input
25 process. He noted that DSA plans to have a draft proposal for the Building Standards
26 Commission next May. Mr. Smith added that DSA hopes most of the proposals will go
27 through without major controversy or delay, so the comment process is important.

28
29 Mr. Smith said the amendment process cannot move forward in some areas until the
30 new standards are published, and those documents are supposed to be available
31 sometime in November. He noted each amendment has to be judged against nine
32 criteria, but there does not appear to be sufficient justification for some of the proposed
33 amendments, so DSA will need to examine those provisions in more detail.

34
35 Mr. Smith observed that California's adoption of the IBC will be the most comprehensive
36 change in building codes that the state has ever seen. He noted the change impacts all
37 aspects of the code across the board, from structural to nonstructural, access, and fire
38 life safety.

39
40 Mr. Bate commented that the IBC is a more performance-based code, with objective
41 standards rather than prescriptive instructions.

42
43 Mr. Dyson said the Structural Engineers Association was interested in providing input,
44 and he asked if the electronic system has any way of tallying and weighing votes. Mr.
45 Smith responded that the templates ask commenters to indicate whether they are in
46 favor of revising, continuing, or repealing the amendment; identify which of the nine
47 criteria are met by the amendment; and then tell whether the opinion comes from an
48 individual or represents the consensus of an organization. He added that the quality of
49 the supporting information will also be taken into consideration.

50
51 Mr. Dyson asked about the status of OSHPD's code amendment efforts. Mr. Smith said
52 he heard that OSHPD has been unsuccessful in hiring a code engineer. He noted

1 OSHPD co-adopts about 90 percent of DSA's amendments, but DSA did not want to
2 wait for them. He added that DSA welcomes participation from OSHPD.

3
4 Mr. Shields stated that DSA is way out ahead of other agencies in terms of its code
5 amendment process, and he commended the staff for their leadership.

6
7 Mr. Shields invited Mr. Dennis Bellet to discuss DSA's follow-up activities pertaining to
8 AB 300. Mr. Bellet noted a 2002 newspaper article led to requests from a number
9 school districts for more detailed information from DSA about their buildings, and a
10 newspaper obtained DSA's list through a public records request. As a result, DSA
11 decided to send the list to anyone requesting it.

12
13 Mr. Bellet reported that the entire 43-report is available on the Web, along with an
14 explanation of what the information means. He noted AB 300 required DSA to conduct
15 a statewide scoping to estimate the number of vulnerable pre-1976, non-wood-frame
16 school buildings. Based on available documents and information reported by school
17 districts, DSA found about 7,000 potentially vulnerable buildings, 75 percent of which
18 were within Seismic Zone 4. Mr. Bellet said this clearly indicates a problem.

19
20 Mr. Dyson noted there is no legislative mandate for DSA to do any more than a scoping
21 study.

22
23 Mr. Peterson thanked Mr. Bellet for providing the report and supporting documents. He
24 said the information is being taken seriously by school districts, so there will be a public
25 benefit from the effort.

26
27 Mr. Richard Conrad reported that he has been busy with the Excellence project, and
28 significant progress is being made in finding authors and developing articles.

29
30 Mr. Conrad said things are going well with the Certified Access Specialist program and
31 the Academy, and the two programs will be working together in the future to develop
32 certification-related training.

33
34 Mr. Levernier* advised that the DSA staff is working on pre-check approval procedures
35 for modular buildings and over-the-counter procedures.

36
37 Mr. Levernier* noted that the earlier report on the community colleges project may have
38 created a misperception that DSA does not have enough policies and procedures, but
39 he said he checked the Website and found a thick stack of policy and procedure
40 documents.

41
42 Mr. Noble reported on the status of the certification of the accessibility provisions in the
43 California Building Code by the U.S. Department of Justice. He said about 75 percent
44 of the materials have been provided. Once DOJ responds, it is likely the accessibility
45 provisions will be certified, but it is difficult to estimate how long that process will take.
46 Mr. Noble explained that once the code is certified, people can be assured that building
47 to the California Building Code standards will also meet ADA.

48 Mr. Shields welcomed Mr. Michael Reichle, California Geological Survey, and Mr. Dan
49 Nehera, State Fire Marshal's office.

50
51 **New Business**

52 Mr. Peterson recommended that the DSA Advisory Board address the issue of the

1 \$25,000 and \$100,000 thresholds for DSA review. He noted if the amounts are
2 indexed, those figures will increase significantly.

3
4 Mr. Levernier* stated that DSA analyzed the law and confirmed that annual adjustments
5 are required. He noted DSA decided to use the construction index, which resulted in
6 \$30,400 and \$110,000 thresholds, respectively. He said DSA will probably issue a
7 notification in a few weeks.

8
9 Mr. Dyson noted that Mr. Mehta had asked for the Board's assistance in several areas.
10 He asked if resources from northern California could be deployed to help relieve the
11 San Diego Office. Mr. Conrad* responded that this option will be considered.

12
13 Mr. Shields observed that DSA's 100th anniversary is coming up in 2007. He
14 encouraged Board members to take part in planning a celebration with the staff.

15
16 **Meeting Summary/Next Steps/Next Meeting Dates**

17 DSA Advisory Board members approved the following meeting dates:

- 18 • **November 17, 2005: Emergency Preparedness Committee**
- 19 • **December 6, 2005: Inspection and Testing Committee**
- 20 • **December 12, 2005: Codes and Standards Committee**
- 21 • **January 19, 2006: DSA Advisory Board**
- 22 • **Access Committee: to be determined**
- 23 • **Excellence Committee: to be determined (January)**
- 24 • **Policy and Procedures: to be determined**

25
26 **Public Comments**

27 There were no members of the public who wished to address the DSA Advisory Board.

28
29 Mr. Shields reminded Board members to return their completed surveys to the staff.

30
31 Mr. Shields thanked Board members whose terms were expiring.

32
33 **Adjournment**

34 There being no further business, there was a motion and second that the meeting be
35 adjourned. The motion was carried unanimously, and the meeting was adjourned at
36 3:30 p.m.